

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

DAVID STEBBINS

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CASE NO. 11-1362

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

DEFENDANTS

MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR: NOV. 18, 2011

Comes now, *pro se* Plaintiff David Stebbins, who respectfully submits the following motion for sanctions against attorneys Steven Rummage and John Goldmark for making frivolous arguments about the lack of my case's merit.

Probably the frivolous argument which stands out the most is their argument that, because Microsoft did not respond to my unilateral amendment offer, that does not show assent, but rather, lack of assent.

Rummage and Goldmark, however, seem to be missing one very crucial detail: That all I am really doing is exactly the same thing that corporations just like Microsoft often use against customers. That is all. Literally, there is no difference whatsoever between what I am doing and what corporations just like Microsoft often do. Can the Defense counsel, in their response in opposition to this motion, cite a single solitary difference? I do not believe that they can.

Wherefore, premises considered, I request that the Defense counsel be issued an appropriate sanction for making a frivolous argument of law in violation of FRCP Rule 11(b).

By s/ David A. Stebbins

David A. Stebbins
8527 Hopewell Rd
Harrison, AR 72601
870-743-4386
stebbinsd@yahoo.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

DAVID STEBBINS

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CASE NO. 11-1362

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

DEFENDANTS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, *pro se* Plaintiff David Stebbins, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that a true and correct copy of Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions was served on John Goldmark & Steve Rummage, attorneys for the defense, by allowing them to view the ECF Notice of Docket Activity, as allowed by CR 5(b).

By s/ David A. Stebbins

David A. Stebbins
8527 Hopewell Rd
Harrison, AR 72601
870-743-4386
stebbinsd@yahoo.com